

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/034,336 03/04/98 AGA

H AGA-6

001444 HM12/1220  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
624 NINTH STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

MORAN, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

9

DATE MAILED:

12/20/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>09/034,336</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Aga et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Marjorie Moran</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1623</b>

**THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]**

- a)  expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Dec 7, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- The proposed amendment(s):

- ~~will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. have been postponed.~~
- will not be entered because:
- they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

MARUTA does make obvious addition of trehalose to aqueous systems (col. 13, lines 7-64), and specifically teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants; i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating (see below)

- The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: None

Claims objected to: None

Claims rejected: 5-10 and 27-30

- The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ has  has not been approved by the Examiner.

- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

- Other activity (col. 13, line 65-col. 14, line 28), therefore all of the limitations of the claims are taught by the prior art and the examiner did not use improper hindsight reasoning. The examiner maintains that a method of stabilizing an antioxidant is inherently a method of inhibiting a decrease in the activity of the antioxidant.

*R. Gitomer*  
RALPH GITOMER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200